

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

16 JUL 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: Assistant for Resources, DDA

SUBJECT : Murphy Commission Recommendations

1. Although it is a matter of opinion, we do not accept the proposition that all language institutions provide appropriate training for our specific needs and that the instruction will be of equal quality. We feel we must examine the cost effectiveness of the Commission's language recommendation.

2. Two-thirds of all language instruction is in French, German, Russian and Spanish. This is accomplished by two-thirds of the language instructional staff. It totals 100,000 student hours and is performed by the equivalent of 23 full-time instructors with the addition of four professional linguists. These four languages average 1,800 hours of actual classroom instruction per year. Based on the attached current cost schedule, it does not appear to be cost effective to send such a volume of students to an enlarged or redesigned FSI. The FSI schedule of courses is rarely altered. They stand firm on this and also on non-approval of part-time training. All part-time training would be prohibitive in cost due to manpower loss. Our one-hour maintenance courses now require only a five-minute walk versus considerable loss in travel time. FSI discourages part-time language training. They handle this usually on a tutorial basis which, again, is not cost effective. Loss in manpower and in flexibility occurs when required to adhere to regularly scheduled starting dates. Often employees cannot fit into other government agency courses and the traditional September starting dates. With the Agency's present mode of staffing overseas positions, it is often possible to give short versions only of standard courses. If our employees were enrolled in FSI courses, we would be forced to pay for services not rendered, not to mention FSI's insistence on full-time training. There would be considerable loss of time "on the desk" when forced into a standard schedule. Our courses are job-related to the Area Divisions and their schedules.

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

STAT

5. Neither the volume of principal language instruction nor the loss of employee time would be cost effective, not to belabor real operational flexibility.

6. OTR would not be directly affected by changes in the FSI operation designed to train officers to fulfill the assessment role in foreign service reporting. OTR's notion of the caliber of such foreign service reporting stems largely from the experiences of its individual officers outside the OTR environment. Our impression is that, for a variety of reasons including resource restraints, the State Department has deliberately cut back on the foreign service reporting role. Thus, we doubt that much could be accomplished by expanding the FSI effort when the general State Department philosophy appears to be to relegate the assessments role to a somewhat secondary position in the duties of a foreign service officer. We also doubt that in-service university enrollment of foreign service officers would make a very direct contribution to the improvement of foreign service reporting. It is hard to see how such enrollments could be effectively tuned to meet requirements of proper area depth and functional expertise for foreign service officers.

1/5
[Redacted]
Acting Chief, Plans and Resources Staff
Office of Training

STAT

Distribution:

O & 1 - Adse [Redacted]
1 - PRS - [Redacted] VE - INTERNAL USE ONLY
1 - TAP